



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
07/24/2003	Nam Su Choi	2336-197	1100
T590 08/30/2006 LOWE HAUPTMAN GOPSTEIN GILMAN & BERNER, LLP Suite 310 1700 Diagonal Road Alexandria, VA 22314		EXAMINER	
		LEE, MICHAEL	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		2622	
ı(08/30/2006 IAN GOPSTEIN G	08/30/2006 IAN GOPSTEIN GILMAN & BERNER, LLP	08/30/2006 EXAM IAN GOPSTEIN GILMAN & BERNER, LLP d ART UNIT

DATE MAILED: 08/30/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
		10/625,682	CHOI ET AL.		
Office Action	Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
		M. Lee	2622		
The MAILING DATE Period for Reply	of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
WHICHEVER IS LONGEF - Extensions of time may be available after SIX (6) MONTHS from the may be available after SIX (6) MONTHS from the may be a fixed by the set of	R, FROM THE MAILING D. le under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 ailing date of this communication. bove, the maximum statutory period valued period for reply will, by statute ter than three months after the mailing	Y IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(SATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONEI and the second state of this communication, even if timely filed	I. lely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status					
1) Responsive to comm	nunication(s) filed on <u>05 Ji</u>	<u>uly 2006</u> .			
2a) This action is FINAL	, <u> </u>				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is					
closed in accordanc	e with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	3 O.G. 213.		
Disposition of Claims					
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-6,8-12,14-16,18-21 and 24-29</u> is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
	14-16, 18-21, 24-29 is/are	rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/ar	-				
8) Claim(s) are	subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.			
Application Papers					
9) The specification is o	bjected to by the Examine	er.			
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
11) The oath or declarati	ion is objected to by the Ex	caminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 11	9				
a) All b) Some * 1. Certified copie 2. Certified copie 3. Copies of the application from	c) None of: es of the priority document es of the priority document certified copies of the prio om the International Burea	s have been received in Applicati	on No ed in this National Stage		
Attachment(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PT		4) 🔲 Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da			
Notice of Draftsperson's Paten Information Disclosure Statemer Paper No(s)/Mail Date	t Drawing Review (P10-948) ent(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)		ate Patent Application (PTO-152)		

Application/Control Number: 10/625,682 Page 2

Art Unit: 2622

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States
- 2. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gardner et al. (5,592,234).

Regarding claim 1, Gardner shows an interface connector (48,52), which meets the claimed connector means, a digital logic and memory controller, which meets the claimed microprocessor, a tuner 56.1, which meets the claimed tuner means, and an inherently included audio signal processing circuit for processing the audio signal received from tuner 56.1, which meets the audio processor as claimed. It should be noted that the digital logic and memory controller 56.2 communicates directly with microprocessor 38 from a television receiver 10 and controls the tuning operations of the tuner 56.1. The controller inherently includes at least one program memory, such as ROM, for controlling the tuning operations. Gardner also shows that the RF signal can be received from either an antenna (Figure 2) or a cable (Figure 5).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and

Art Unit: 2622

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 2-6, 8-12, 14-16, 18-21, and 24-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gardner et al. (5,592,234) in view of Jung (6,483,553).

Regarding claim 2, Gardner does not specify that the microprocessor includes an analog broadcast/digital broadcast selection signal as claimed. Instead, Gardner shows two embodiments (Figures 2 and 5) each using an analog tuner and a digital tuner for receiving the respective analog and digital television signals, and each has a digital controller for carrying out the tuning operations. This setup can be costly and inefficient because two separate tuners and controllers are needed. In order to solve above problems, Jung teaches that the two should be combined into a single receiver unit (see col. 5, lines 22-28). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include the analog/digital hybrid feature of Jung into Gardner to perform the well known functions as claimed.

Regarding claim 3, see Figure 5 of Jung.

Regarding claim 4, Gardner shows a power terminal (power supply 40), a transmission terminal 44, a reception terminal 54, and an A/V terminal (analog section in 56.2). But Gardner does not specify the video signal terminal and audio signal terminal as claimed. Jung teaches a video decoder 1400 and an audio decoder 1300 for decoding both the video signal and the audio signal, respectively. By using separate audio and video decoders on the digital tuner and the analog tuner, signal processing constraint problems caused by single combined decoder can be avoided. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

Art Unit: 2622

was made to include the video and audio decoders of Jung into Gardner to perform the well known functions as claimed.

Regarding claim 5, see connector 48.

Regarding claim 6, in addition of above, Gardner further shows a power supply 40, a remote control 34, which meets the key input as claimed, a microprocessor 38, which meets the claimed controller, a signal processor 26, a display unit 30, and a speaker 20. Gardner further shows a plurality of power outputs (see 40). Although not shown, the outputs could be different voltages

Regarding claim 8, see rejection to claim 4.

Regarding claim 9, see rejection to claim 5.

Regarding claim 10, see tuner 56.1.

Regarding claim 11, Gardner does not specify the plasma display panel as claimed. Instead, a CRT is shown. In any event, the display device in Gardner is clearly not limited to CRT because a CRT display can be replaced with any known display device. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to replace the CRT with a plasma display panel to perform the well known functions as claimed.

Regarding claim 12, see rejection to claim 6.

Regarding clam 14, see rejection to claim 4.

Regarding claim 15, in addition of rejection to claim 11, replacing the CRT with a LCD display would have been obvious.

Art Unit: 2622

Regarding claim 16, in addition of rejections to claims 1 and 6, the connector 48 and plug 54, respectively meet the first and second connectors as claimed.

Regarding claim 18, see rejection to claim 2.

Regarding claim 19, see rejection to claim 3.

Regarding claim 20, see rejection to claim 4.

Regarding claim 21, see rejection to claim 5.

Regarding claim 24, see rejection to claim 4.

Regarding claim 25, see rejection to claim 5.

Regarding claim 26, see rejection to claim 10.

Regarding claims 27-29, see rejection to claim 15.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 7/05/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In considering applicant's argument that the cited references do not disclose a TV receiving module which receives power (or voltage) from the power supply of the display apparatus via connector means, as called for in claim 1, the Examiner disagrees. As shown in Figure 2, Gardner clearly shows a power supply 40 from a display apparatus (26, 28, 30) for providing power or voltage to a TV receiving module (50) through an interface connector 48 and plug 52. The arrangement of Gardner clearly meets the claimed invention.

Art Unit: 2622

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to M. Lee whose telephone number 571-272-7349. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 9 to 6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David L. Ometz, can be reached on 571-272-7593. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

Art Unit: 2622

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 2622